

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of June 27, 2008 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

Applicants have cancelled Claims 8-25. However, Applicants are not conceding that the cancelled claims fail to present patentable subject matter. The cancellations are solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution. Accordingly, the cancellations should not be interpreted as the surrender of any subject matter, and Applicants expressly reserve the right to present the cancelled claims in any future divisional or continuation applications from the present application.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102 & §103**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-16, 18-20, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application 2005/0044197 to Lai (hereinafter Lai). Claims 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai in view of U.S. Published Patent Application 2002/0078210 to Aschir (hereinafter Aschir).

Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are moot because Lai is not available as prior art reference as discussed below:

**Applicants' Invention Predates Lai**

Applicants believe that any rejections are moot because Applicants' invention predates the August 18, 2003 effective date of Lai.

Appln No. 10/718,442  
Amendment dated August 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2008  
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0055-(426)

Applicants of the present invention conceived their invention at least as early as October 15, 2002 and actively pursued its reduction to practice from a date prior to the earliest effective date of Lai. In support of their assertions of conception, diligence, and constructive reduction to practice, Applicants submit the Declarations attached hereto in accordance with 37 CFR § 1.131 along with other supporting evidence of Applicants' diligence in pursuing the present Application. The Declarations provide the sworn testimony of Applicants affirming their conception and continuing diligence from a time prior to the earliest effective date August 18, 2003 of Lai to the filing of the instant Application on November 20, 2003. Please note that the Declarations by Applicants Victor Moore and Joseph McIntyre are unsigned. Declarations with their signatures will be submitted as soon as such signed copies are obtained.

Along with these Declarations, Applicants also submit herewith a copy of a confidential invention disclosure, No. BOC8-2002-0108, titled "Web Services using WebSphere Telecom Application Server," authored by Applicant Tom Creamer (hereinafter Disclosure). The Disclosure was created on October 15, 2002 and submitted on October 25, 2002 to a Patent Attorney/Intellectual Property (IP) Professional employed by the assignee of the present invention; International Business Machines Corporation (IBM).

The Disclosure explicitly describes the present invention. The written description provided in the Disclosure (see particularly pages 2-4) is clear evidence of Applicants' conception of the claimed subject matter at least as early as October 15, 2002.

The Disclosure is an IBM confidential disclosure form. As such, it is a standardized document that, according to established IBM procedures, is used by IBM inventors to document the conception of an invention. Strictly-followed internal procedures established by IBM govern the use of all such confidential disclosure forms. One aspect of IBM's established procedures governing the use of such confidential

disclosure forms is that no substantive modifications can be made to a confidential disclosure after it has been submitted to an IBM Patent Attorney/IP Professional.

Applicants exercised due diligence from prior to the earliest effective date August 18, 2003 of Lai to the date November 20, 2003 that the Application was filed. As expressly affirmed in the Declarations, Applicants, from at least the earliest effective date of Lai, through the filing of the Application on November 20, 2003, worked diligently toward a constructive reduction to practice of the invention. Applicants initially worked with IBM's own in-house Patent Attorneys/IP professionals during an internal review of the invention, including assessing the invention in the context of related literature. Subsequently, Applicants worked with Patent Attorneys retained by IBM (outside counsel) to prepare and file the Application.

Outside counsel prepared the Application consistent with long-established professional practices, according to which cases are prepared on a first-in, first-out basis unless a particular application is associated with a bar date; those applications associated with bar dates are granted priority within the work queue. Outside counsel followed this professionally-accepted practice in preparing the Application in this case.

The written description and each of the claims of the Application were prepared based upon the Applicants' attached Disclosure. Moreover, according to IBM's established procedures governing the use of such disclosures and Applicants' sworn testimony in the Declarations, Applicants reviewed the Application prior to its submission to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in order to ensure that the claims and written description contained therein were fully supported by the Disclosure.

The following documentary evidence is submitted herewith in supporting Applicants' claims of due diligence:

- Exhibit A is a letter from an IBM Patent Attorney requesting outside counsel prepare the Application, dated June 20, 2003;

Appln No. 10/718,442  
Amendment dated August 8, 2008.  
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2008  
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0055 (426)

- Exhibit B is a letter from outside counsel confirming receipt of the instructions, dated June 24, 2003.
- Exhibit C is an email letter from outside counsel requesting review and approval of the Application drafted by outside counsel, dated November 4, 2003.
- Exhibit D is an email letter from Applicant Tom Creamer, commenting on the draft Application, dated November 17, 2003.
- Exhibit E is an email letter, dated November 18, 2003, from outside counsel requesting review and approval of the final draft Application, together with Declaration and Power of Attorney and Assignment for the inventors to sign.
- Exhibit F is a copy of the Declaration and Power of Attorney signed by the inventors and filed with the Application on November 20, 2003, evidencing the inventors' approval of the application.

Applicants respectfully submit that it was reasonable for them and the Assignee of their invention, IBM, to rely on outside counsel in preparing the Application, and that outside counsel acted with diligence. Applicants and outside counsel operated under the constraints of other work obligations while preparing the Application. As noted in MPEP § 2138.06, inventors and their patent attorneys are never required to drop all other work to deal with an issue in a patent application. Applicants therefore submit that Applicants and their Patent Attorneys diligently pursued completion and filing of the present application without any unreasonable delays.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' Declarations, coupled with the documentary evidence of specific activity on specific dates, clearly evidences Applicants' prior conception and diligence in pursuing an actual and constructive reduction to practice from a time prior to the earliest effective date of Lai. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections in connection with Lai.

Appln No. 10/718,442  
Amendment dated August 8, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of June 27, 2008  
Docket No. BOC9-2003-0055 (426)

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

AKERMAN SENTERFITT

Date: August 8, 2008

/Richard A. Hinson/

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652  
Yonghong Chen, Registration No. 56,150  
Customer No. 40987  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000